



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/603,080	06/25/2003	Pasi Jaaskela	59643.00293	1887
32294 7590 03/04/2009 SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P. 8000 TOWERS CRESCENT DRIVE 14TH FLOOR VIENNA, VA 22182-6212				
EXAMINER NGUYEN, DUSTIN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2454				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/04/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/603,080

Applicant(s)

JAASKELA ET AL.

Examiner

DUSTIN NGUYEN

Art Unit

2454

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3-35 are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 11/13/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
3. As per remarks, Applicants argued that (1) Hazelwood and Bot do not teach or suggest transmitting the second message to a service control function configured to analyse a subscriber identity received in a message requesting a tariff for a connection to determine a tariff based on the first field of the received subscriber identity since Hazelwood fails to disclose, or suggest the processing of the prefix occurs prior to the service control function as recited in claims 1, 17 and 18.
4. As to point (1), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Hazelwood discloses a system and method for determining a tariff for a real-time wireless service for a wireless telephone call [Abstract]. The system of Hazelwood includes PPS Service Script [i.e. an operator determination function as claimed] [27, Figures 2 and 3], and a PPS Service Data Point (SDP) [i.e. a tariff determination function as claimed] [22, Figures 2 and 3]. In operation during call setup, the PPS Service Scripts of Hazelwood receives an IDP message transmitted from

GMSC/SSF [i.e. receiving a first message request a tariff for a connection] [31, Figures 2 and 3; Abstract; and col 4, lines 56-67]. The PPS Service Scripts, using the help of LNPP and LNP database, determines a prefix used to identify whether the call is within the operator's Own Network, or in another network [32-35, Figures 2 and 3; and col 5, lines 1-30]. *The PPS Service Script may be modified to add the correct prefix to Originating/Terminating Location information parameters that is sent as part of each rated event* [i.e. forming a modified subscriber identity and a second message requesting a tariff for the connection] [36, Figures 2 and 3; col 5, lines 31-52; col 6, lines 12-19; and col 7, lines 20-27], *then the PPS Service Script sends to the PPS SDP for rating* [i.e. transmitting the second message to a service control function as claimed] [col 5, lines 32-38; and col 6, lines 12-16]. In addition, Hazelwood discloses the PPS Service Script uses the help of the LNPP and LNP database *to determine the prefix, then add that prefix to the Originating/Terminating Location Information parameter, and forward to the PPS SDP for rating* [i.e. the prefix occurs prior to the service control function as argued by Applicants] [Figures 2 and 3; col 5, lines 1-col 6, lines 19].

5. As per remarks, Applicants argued that (2) Bot fails to disclose receiving a type of connection together with an indication of the subscriber identity of the terminal as recited in claims 3 and 25.

6. As to point (2), claims are to be given their broadest reasonable interpretation during prosecution, and the scope of a claim cannot be narrowed by reading specification into the claim. See *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054, 44 USPQ2D 1023, 1027 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *In re*

Zletz, 893 F.2d 319, 321, 13 USPQ2D 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989); In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404, 162 USPQ 541,550 (CCPA 1969). In this case, Bot clearly discloses a type of connection together with an indication of the subscriber identity of the terminal [i.e. a prefix 22 of the access number 22 includes a home network identification number 22a and an *IN* service type identification number 22b, dependent on the *IN* service type identification number 22b, the SSF 4 in the home network 1, now directs the call to a SCF which performs the *IN* function requested such as the SCF 7] [Figure 2; and paragraphs 0019 and 0020]. As such, the claims remain rejected over the cited prior art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1, 3-9, 11-31, 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hazelwood [US Patent No 7,043,229], in view of Bot et al. [US Patent Application No 2004/0242226].

9. As per claim 1, Hazelwood discloses the invention as claimed including a method [i.e. a system or method for determining a tariff for wireless calls made to or from ported directory numbers] [Abstract; col 1, lines 9-13; and col 2, lines 21-31] comprising:

receiving a first message requesting a tariff for a connection [i.e. MSC/SSF or GMSC/SSF sends a IDP message to the SCP] [31, Figure 2 and 3; col 4, lines 56-60; and col 5, lines 53-60] and including a subscriber identity field comprising an indication of a subscriber identity of a terminal that is to terminate the connection [i.e. a call setup message containing a called party number] [col 2, lines 35-41; and col 4, lines 65-67], each terminal in a communication system being associated with any of a plurality of operators and being addressable by the subscriber identity formatted to include a first field and a second field, the first field being, for at least some of the subscriber identities, indicative of the operator with which a respective subscriber identity is associated [i.e. IDP message and operator prefix] [paragraphs 0026-0029];

determining the operator to which the subscriber identity of the terminal that is to terminate the connection is assigned [i.e. the scripts determine whether the routing number points to the network operator's own network or another] [Abstract; col 2, lines 23-31; and col 5, lines 15-19], and content of the first field that is associated with that operator [i.e. prefix values] [col 5, lines 19-47];

forming a second message requesting a tariff for a connection and including a subscriber identity field comprising the modified subscriber identity [i.e. based on the result of the query, the PSL scripts add the correct prefix and send to the PPS SDP for rating] [56, Figures 4 and 5; and col 6, lines 51-58; and col 7, lines 20-27]; and

transmitting the second message to a service control function configured to analyse a subscriber identity received in a message requesting a tariff for a connection to determine a

tariff based on the first field of the received subscriber identity [i.e. send to PPS SDP for rating] [col 3, lines 2-5; col 4, lines 19-23; and col 7, lines 28-44].

Hazlewood does not specifically disclose

forming a modified subscriber identity having as its second field at least the content of the second field of the subscriber identity of the terminal that is to terminate the connection and having as its first field the said content of the first field that is associated with that operator.

Bot discloses

forming a modified subscriber identity having as its second field at least the content of the second field of the subscriber identity of the terminal that is to terminate the connection and having as its first field the said content of the first field that is associated with that operator [i.e. redirect message comprising a destination number comprising the number sent from the terminal and the prefix added by the SCF] [Figure 2; Abstract; and paragraphs, 0005, 0006, 0009 and 0019, lines 24-40].

It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Hazlewood and Bot because the teaching of Bot would allow implementation as well as maintenance of a service is easy, as the IN service to be accessed as well as a determination of the prefix is located in the same network [Bot, paragraphs 0006].

10. As per claim 3, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 1. Furthermore, Hazlewood does not specifically disclose receiving together with the indication of the subscriber identity of the terminal that is to terminate the connection an indication of the type of the connection; forming the second message so as to include the indication of the type of the

connection; and wherein the control function is configured to control the determination of the tariff based on the first field of the received subscriber identity and the indication of the type of the connection. Bot discloses receiving together with the indication of the subscriber identity of the terminal that is to terminate the connection an indication of the type of the connection; forming the second message so as to include the indication of the type of the connection; and wherein the control function is configured to control the determination of the tariff based on the first field of the received subscriber identity and the indication of the type of the connection [i.e. determining the type of IN service from the In service type identification number] [22b, Figure 2; and paragraphs 0010, 0011 and 0019, lines 40-45]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Hazlewood and Bot because the teaching of Bot would allow implementation as well as maintenance of a service is easy, as the IN service to be accessed as well as a determination of the prefix is located in the same network [Bot, paragraphs 0006].

11. As per claim 4, Hazlewood discloses wherein the said determining step includes looking up the subscriber identity of the terminal that is to terminate the connection in the first database configured to store a list of subscriber identities and for each subscriber identity an indication of the operator with which the respective subscriber identity is associated, and retrieving any indication of an operator associated therewith in the first database [i.e. Local Number Portability database] [13, Figures 2-5; and col 1, lines 51-col 2, lines 12].

12. As per claim 5, Hazlewood discloses wherein the indication of an operator is the said content of the first field that is associated with that operator [i.e. prefix values] [col 5, lines 15-47].

13. As per claim 6, Hazlewood discloses determining comprises looking up the said indication of an operator in a second database configured with a list of indicators of operators and for each indicator content of the first field that is associated with that operator, and retrieving content of the first field associated therewith [i.e. prefix values table] [col 5, lines 15-47; and col 6, lines 45-58].

14. As per claim 7, Hazlewood discloses wherein the subscriber identity field of the message requesting the tariff for a connection does not include the first field of the subscriber identity of the terminal that is to terminate the connection [i.e. IDP message contains the MSISDN of the PPS subscriber and the CdPN] [col 4, lines 65-67; and col 5, lines 59-60].

15. As per claim 8, Hazlewood discloses wherein if determination is made that the content of the first field of the subscriber identity of the terminal is associated with the operator to which that subscriber identity is assigned, the second message requesting the tariff for a connection is formed with a subscriber identity field comprising the subscriber identity unmodified [i.e. if number is not ported] [col 5, lines 38-41; and col 6, lines 41-45].

16. As per claim 9, Hazelwood discloses wherein the messages are IDP messages [Abstract; and col 5, lines 59-60].

17. As per claim 11, Hazlewood discloses wherein each subscriber identity is a telephone number [i.e. ported telephone number] [Abstract; and col 2, lines 21-31].

18. As per claim 12, Hazlewood discloses wherein each first field is an operator prefix [i.e. prefix values] [col 5, lines 19-47].

19. As per claim 13, Hazlewood discloses wherein the service control function comprises a service control point (SCP) of an intelligent network (IN) [Figures 2-5; and col 4, lines 46-55].

20. As per claim 14, Hazlewood discloses wherein each message requesting the tariff for a connection comprises a source field for indicating a source of the message, the source field of the first message comprises an indication of the source of the first message and the source field of the second message comprises an indication of the source of the first message [col 4, lines 56-67; and col 6, lines 2-11].

21. As per claim 15, Hazlewood discloses controlling, by the service control function, the determining of the tariff for the connection; and applying the tariff to the connection [col 7, lines 14-27].

22. As per claim 16, Hazlewood does not specifically disclose wherein the connection is a connection for transfer of data. Bot discloses wherein the connection is a connection for transfer of data [i.e. voice mail] [paragraph 0002]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Hazlewood and Bot because the teaching of Bot would allow implementation as well as maintenance of a service is easy, as the IN service to be accessed as well as a determination of the prefix is located in the same network [Bot, paragraphs 0006].
23. As per claim 17, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 1.
24. As per claim 18, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 1.
25. As per claim 19, Hazlewood discloses wherein the control function is a charging control function [paragraphs 0006 and 0020].
26. As per claim 20, Hazlewood discloses wherein the service control function is a tariff control function [Abstract; and paragraph 0002].
27. As per claim 21, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 19.
28. As per claim 22, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 20.

- 29. As per claim 23, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 19.
- 30. As per claim 24, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 20.
- 31. As per claim 25, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 3.
- 32. As per claim 26, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 4.
- 33. As per claim 27, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 5.
- 34. As per claim 28, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 6.
- 35. As per claim 29, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 7.
- 36. As per claim 30, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 8.
- 37. As per claim 31, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 9.
- 38. As per claim 33, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 11.
- 39. As per claim 34, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 12.

40. As per claim 35, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 14.
41. Claims 10 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hazlewood [US Patent No 7,043,229], in view of Bot et al. [US Patent Application No 2004/0242226], and further in view of Aijala [US Patent Application No 2002/0176405].
42. As per claim 10, Hazlewood and Bot do not specifically disclose wherein the messages are session initiation protocol INVITE messages. Aijala discloses wherein the messages are session initiation protocol INVITE messages [Figure 2; Abstract; and paragraphs 0024 and 0025]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Hazlewood, Bot and Aijala because Aijala's teaching of SIP messages would allow to create, modify, and terminate voice calls carried over an IP network [Aijala, paragraph 0002].
43. As per claim 32, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 10.
- 44. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dustin Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3971. The examiner can normally be reached on flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached at (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Dustin Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2454

